



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

of the war shows only her desperation, and shows also, in a most revealing light, the fundamental reasons why, in this contest, civilization and humanity must see that she shall not win.

L. G. ROBERTS.

BOSTON, MASS.

FROM AN UNDAUNTED CHAMPION OF GERMANY

SIR,—To repeat a quotation of your own, you have, I think, most decidedly "come on," in your "America First." It is nearly startling! The editor of *THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW*, usually so urbane, so amusedly superior to all the excitements that generally prevail, almost loses his self-control.

May I, however, referring to a few statements in this article, voice another point of view?

First of all, I am quite convinced that all German-Americans, including Americans of German descent, *do* put "America First." You cannot blame them, however, for resenting what seems to them the unjust discrimination against Germany expressed so forcefully and regardlessly in the American press.

You say, "We are not of those who would evade responsibility or avert criticism by shouting vaguely, 'Stand by the President'; that is a course befitting subjects, not citizens" (page 162). But (page 168) you speak of "the traitorous utterances of hyphenated editors who write as Germans." Does not that seem a bit inconsistent?

You intimate that Germany it was who "tore up 'the scrap of paper.'" The German minister said explicitly that he was referring to England's general attitude toward treaties when he used that expression. Did he not? I am sure that I read that somewhere. Some one separated the words from the context and stated that this was the self-confessed attitude of Germany.

You say that declaring a "war zone" was a "brazen violation of international law." Are we not very technical, suddenly, about our observance of international law? Did not the President advise Americans to leave Mexico when it became dangerous to remain there? Would it have been improper, then, to advise Americans to observe caution about venturing into the danger zone? I know a lady who sailed for England a day after the *Lusitania*. Her husband, an American, living in London, advised her to be certain to book her passage on an American ship. She arrived in England safely. Was that not slight enough caution to observe?

Considering the matter legally, however, was it United States law to ship ammunition with passengers? Or to allow a belligerent thus to sail from our own ports? Are not our contentions based on rather dubious premises?

And again, considering the matter legally and based on your own premises: "It is this explicitly guaranteed right to engage in free intercourse and commerce with other nations that we contend for." Does not the case, resting on these premises, involve our interrupted commerce with Germany, as admitted by yourself upon previous occasions? But what a fine distinction our pro-British editors are making! We do not seem to be filled with the slightest acrimony toward England. We must be very careful not to allow a little thing like that to affect our relations with Eng-

land. It would not be a very opportune time, to be sure, to become involved in war with both England and Germany.

Again, regarding the "war zone." Is it not also against international law to declare an ineffective blockade? At the beginning, the English blockade was not even a declared blockade, and is certainly ineffective. But that is passed over quite lightly by our pro-British editors.

We will admit that the case against Germany involves the loss of human lives, American human lives.

It seems to me that a good way for us to put ourselves in the right would be to safeguard *German* and other lives in Mexico. Do we not hold ourselves responsible for as much when we base our attitude in all matters concerning this continent on the Monroe Doctrine?

I was amazed to learn that so many *American* lives were lost in Mexico. The American press seems to have passed over this fact very lightly. Our self-righteousness in the case against Germany, all things considered, takes on a rather amusing aspect, despite the "cause of humanity."

"*Deutschland über Alles*," is, of course, merely the German equivalent to our "America First." Hence the controversy.

Shall we declare war on Mexico, England and Germany? Why should we alone—Mexico apparently being past consideration—be "pig-headed"? Can *we* not arbitrate? The German Emperor stated that French aviators had dropped bombs on German cities before he declared war. We criticized him for plunging into war for such a reason, and a few others. Then why should we? Will it bring back the dead?

We may say, or at least hope, that "*never* so long as patriotic spirit animates American beings shall this free Republic be found guilty before God and history of violation of those principles of highest humanity which are the foundations of every national existence and of all civilization," but can we say, *never* has it been guilty? Then why set ourselves upon a pedestal, breaking our own laws, failing to fulfill our own obligations, and condemning a nation with the fiercest denunciations, which is, after all, one against many?

Does anybody think that Belgium would have resisted Germany if it had not depended on England and France, if it had not, in fact, very likely had an understanding with these two nations? Why ignore all the data from various sources which seem to prove this? Oh, because we are pro-British.

I believe the editor has, at least, given us the most ironically masterful misinterpretation of the German note extant.

(MISS) J. MANDERY.

ROCHESTER, N. Y.

WAR WITH DIGNITY

SIR,—I can't refrain from a word of commendation for "America First," your last editorial broadside. I read it twice, every word and slowly, and it is the most forceful and unanswerable presentation of the present situation. How any self-respecting citizen of this "land of the free" can look at it differently I cannot imagine. I have heard the German arguments from German sympathizers:

1. Germany had declared a war zone. Yes, but by what right, except by an effectual blockade?